

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                  | FILING DATE                 | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO.     |  |  |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| 10/582,149                       | 06/08/2006                  | Friedhelm Schmitz    | 2003P08284WOUS      | 8840                 |  |  |
| 22116<br>SIEMENS CO              | 7590 09/25/200<br>RPORATION | EXAM                 | EXAMINER            |                      |  |  |
| INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT |                             |                      | BLACKWELL,          | BLACKWELL, GWENDOLYN |  |  |
| ISELIN, NJ 08                    | VENUE SOUTH                 | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                      |  |  |
| , , , , , ,                      |                             |                      | 1794                |                      |  |  |
|                                  |                             |                      |                     |                      |  |  |
|                                  |                             |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE        |  |  |
|                                  |                             |                      | 09/25/2009          | PAPER                |  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No.     | Applicant(s)   |  |  |
|---------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 10/582,149          | SCHMITZ ET AL. |  |  |
| Examiner            | Art Unit       |  |  |
| GWENDOLYN BLACKWELL | 1794           |  |  |

|   |   | GWENDOLYN BLACKWELL  | 1794   |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the o  | correspondence add                               | ress                                |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.   |   |  |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| ap<br>ap<br>for   | I. Me The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 3 T CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: |  |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) 🗖<br>b) 🏻  | The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(   | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE      | date of the final rejection                      | n.                                  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding encount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding encount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee house 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set fort in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL |   |  |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Th   | e Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br>ng the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br>tice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of the                           | s of the date of<br>appeal. Since a |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. X T<br>(a)<br>(b)<br>(c)   | he proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t they raise new issues that would require further cou they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo they are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or they present additional daims without canceling a   | nsideration and/or search (see NOT<br>w);<br>ter form for appeal by materially rec<br>corresponding number of finally reje | TE below);<br>ducing or simplifying t            |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. 🗌 A<br>6. 🔲 N  | NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1<br>ne amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12<br>pplicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):<br>ewly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all<br>n-allowable claim(s).   | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Con   |  | •                                   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. A Fo<br>ho<br>Th<br>Cli<br>Cli<br>Cli  | or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) we the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved a status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: alm(s) a llowed: alm(s) a llowed: alm(s) objected to: alm(s) rejected: 19-28 and 30-38, alm(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  | l be entered and an e                            | xplanation of                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. 🏻 Th   | VIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE e affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu cause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and is not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).   |  |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
| en<br>sh  | e affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br>tered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br>owing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary  | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>and was not earlier presented. Se   | al and/or appellant fail<br>se 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1 | s to provide a<br>).                |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | he affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation<br>ST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER   | n of the status of the claims after er   | ntry is below or attach                          | ed.                                 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. 🛭 T   | he request for reconsideration has been considered bu<br>See Continuation Sheet.  |  | condition for allowan                            | ce because:                         |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | lote the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (<br>other:  | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).  |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   | /GWENDOLYN BLACK   |  |                                     |  |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed claim amendments do not put the application in condition for allowance as the claim language has been changed from open language to consisting of, which would require further consideration in addition to the proposed amending of claim 21 having a metallic protective layer that does not seem to fit the disclosed invention. The proposed amending of claim 34 raises issues of new matter as it is unclear the basis for the endpoint of "over 0.2".

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are based upon entry of the proposed daim amendments. As the proposed claim amendments are not being entered the arguments are moot. The final rejection dated July 2, 2009, rejecting claims 19-28 and 30-38 is maintained.